

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TRAVIS JACK GOODMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

REYES, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 1:24-cv-00051-KES-EPG (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING
ACTION WITH PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE
TO STATE A CLAIM, FAILURE TO
PROSECUTE, AND FAILURE TO COMPLY
WITH COURT ORDERS

Doc. 15

Plaintiff Travis Jack Goodman (“Goodman”) is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

Goodman seeks to hold defendants liable for creating a threat to his safety while he was incarcerated at the Kern County jail. Doc. 1. The magistrate judge screened Goodman’s complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a) and found that he failed to state a cognizable claim under which relief may be granted. Doc. 7. The magistrate judge found that Goodman did not allege sufficient facts to show deliberate indifference under the Eighth Amendment for failure to protect. *Id.* at 7. The court granted Goodman an opportunity to file an amended complaint, and later granted an extension of time to do so. Docs. 7, 11. Goodman was warned twice that failure to comply with the court’s order may result in dismissal of his action. *Id.* Goodman updated his address on May 2, 2024 (Doc. 12), and on May 16, 2024, the County of Kern Sheriff’s Office notified the court that Goodman had been released from custody on April 24, 2024 (Doc. 13).

1 On June 14, 2024, the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations,
2 recommending that Goodman's case be dismissed for failure to state a claim, failure to
3 prosecute, and failure to comply with a court order, and that Goodman's claims be dismissed
4 with prejudice. Doc. 15. The findings and recommendations were served on Goodman and
5 contained notice that objections were to be filed within thirty days of service. *Id.* at 9. Goodman
6 failed to file any objections, and the time to do so has expired.

7 In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the court has conducted a de novo review of
8 this case. Having carefully reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations
9 to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

10 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 11 1. The findings and recommendations issued on June 14, 2024, Doc. 15, are
12 ADOPTED IN FULL;
13 2. This action is DISMISSED with prejudice; and
14 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

15
16
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: August 26, 2024


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE